

APPENDIX G
DEBRIEFING AUTHORITIES
AND SAMPLE DEBRIEFING SUMMARIES

the complexity and duration of the contract task. Determination of contract type should be closely related to the risks involved in timely, cost-effective, and efficient performance. This factor should compensate contractors proportionately for assuming greater cost risks.

(2) The contractor assumes the greatest cost risk in a closely priced firm-fixed-price contract under which it agrees to perform a complex undertaking on time and at a predetermined price. Some firm-fixed-price contracts may entail substantially less cost risk than others because, for example, the contract task is less complex or many of the contractor's costs are known at the time of price agreement, in which case the risk factor should be reduced accordingly. The contractor assumes the least cost risk in a cost-plus-fixed-fee level-of-effort contract, under which it is reimbursed those costs determined to be allocable and allowable, plus the fixed fee.

(3) In evaluating assumption of cost risk, contracting officers shall, except in unusual circumstances, treat time-and-materials, labor-hour, and firm-fixed-price, level-of-effort term contracts as cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

(c) *Federal socioeconomic programs.* This factor measures the degree of support given by the prospective contractor to Federal socioeconomic programs, such as those involving small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, women-owned small businesses, handicapped sheltered workshops, and energy conservation. Greater profit opportunity should be provided contractors who have displayed unusual initiative in these programs.

(d) *Capital investments.* This factor takes into account the contribution of contractor investments to efficient and economical contract performance.

(e) *Cost-control and other past accomplishments.* This factor allows additional profit opportunities to a prospective contractor that has previously demonstrated its ability to perform similar tasks effectively and economically. In addition, consideration should be given to (1) measures taken by the prospective contractor that result in productivity improvements and (2) other cost-reduction accomplishments that will benefit the Government in follow-on contracts.

(f) *Independent development.* Under this factor, the contractor may be provided additional profit opportunities in recognition of independent development efforts relevant to the contract end item without Government assistance. The contracting officer should consider whether the development cost was recovered directly or indirectly from Government sources. [FAC 84-7, 50 FR 23606, 6/4/85, effective 4/30/85; FAC 90-32, 60 FR 48206, 9/18/95, effective 10/1/95]

[**30,169.02**]

15.905-2 Additional factors.

In order to foster achievement of program objectives, each agency may include additional factors in its structured approach or take them into account in the profit analysis of individual contract actions.

SUBPART 15.10—PREAWARD, AWARD, AND POSTAWARD NOTIFICATIONS, PROTESTS, AND MISTAKES

[**30,170**]

15.1001 Definition.

Day, as used in this subpart, has the meaning set forth at 33.101. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

[**30,171**]

15.1002 Applicability.

This subpart applies to the use of competitive proposals, as described in 6.102(b), and a combination of competitive procedures, as described in 6.102(c). To the extent practicable, however, the procedures and intent of this subpart, with reasonable modification, should be followed for acquisitions described in 6.102(d): broad agency announcements, small business innovation research contracts, and architect-engineer contracts. However, they do not apply to multiple award schedules, as described in 6.102(d)(3). [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

30,169.02 FAR 15.905-2

©1997, Commerce Clearing House, Inc.

[**¶ 30,172**]**15.1003 Notifications to unsuccessful offerors.**

(a) *Preaward notices*—(1) Preaward notices of exclusion from competitive range. The contracting officer shall promptly notify offerors when they are excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from further consideration. The notice shall—

(i) State the basis for the determination and that a proposal revision will not be considered;

(ii) Advise the offeror that, if a preaward or postaward debriefing is desired, a written request must be submitted to the contracting officer within three days; and

(iii) Indicate that, absent receipt of a timely written request, the Government is not obligated to provide a preaward or a postaward debriefing.

(2) Preaward notices for small business set-asides. In a small business set-aside (see subpart 19.5), upon completion of negotiations and determinations of responsibility, but prior to award, the contracting officer shall notify each unsuccessful offeror in writing of the name and location of the apparent successful offeror. The notice also shall state that—

(i) The Government will not consider subsequent revisions of the unsuccessful offeror's proposal; and

(ii) No response is required unless a basis exists to challenge the small business size status of the apparent successful offeror. The notice is not required when the contracting officer determines in writing that the urgency of the requirement necessitates award without delay.

(b) *Postaward notices*. Within three days after the date of contract award, the contracting officer shall provide written notification to each unsuccessful offeror (unless preaward notice was given under paragraph (a) of this section).

(1) The notice shall include—

(i) The number of offerors solicited;

(ii) The number of proposals received;

(iii) The name and address of each offeror receiving an award;

Government Contracts Reports

(iv) The items, quantities, and unit prices of each award (if the number of items or other factors makes listing unit prices impracticable, only the total contract price need be furnished); and

(v) In general terms, the reason the offeror's proposal was not accepted, unless the price information in paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section readily reveals the reason. In no event shall an offeror's cost breakdown, profit, overhead rates, trade secrets, manufacturing processes and techniques, or other confidential business information be disclosed to any other offeror.

(2) Upon request, the contracting officer shall furnish the information described in paragraphs (b)(1) (i) through (v) of this section to unsuccessful offerors in solicitations using the simplified acquisition procedures in part 13. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

[**¶ 30,173**]**15.1004 Notification to successful offeror.**

The contracting officer shall award a contract with reasonable promptness to the successful offeror (selected in accordance with 15.611(d)) by transmitting a written notice of the award to that offeror (but see 15.608(b)). When an award is made to an offeror for less than all of the items that may be awarded to that offeror and additional items are being withheld for subsequent award, each notice shall state that the Government may make subsequent awards on those additional items within the offer acceptance period. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

[**¶ 30,174**]**15.1005 Preaward debriefing of offerors.**

Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from further consideration prior to the final source selection decision may request a debriefing before award (10 U.S.C. 2305(b)(6)(A) and 41 U.S.C. 253b(f)-(h)). The process for requesting and conducting preaward debriefings is as follows:

(a) The offeror may request a preaward debriefing by submitting a written request for debriefing to the contracting officer within three days of the receipt of notice of

FAR 15.1005 ¶ 30,174

exclusion from the competitive range. If the offeror does not submit a timely request, the offeror need not be given either a preaward or a postaward debriefing. Offerors are entitled to no more than one debriefing on each acquisition.

(b) The contracting officer should provide a debriefing to the offeror as soon as practicable. If providing a preaward debriefing is not in the best interest of the Government at the time it is requested, the contracting officer may delay the debriefing, but shall provide the debriefing no later than the time postaward debriefings are provided under 15.1006. In that event, the contracting officer shall include the information at 15.1006(d) in the debriefing.

(c) Debriefings may be done orally, in writing, or by any other method acceptable to the contracting officer.

(d) The contracting officer or designee shall chair any debriefing session held. Individuals who conducted the evaluation shall provide support.

(e) At a minimum, preaward debriefings shall include—

(1) The agency's evaluation of significant elements in the offeror's proposal;

(2) A summary of the rationale for excluding the offeror from the competitive range; and

(3) Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed in the process of excluding the offeror from the competitive range.

(f) Preaward debriefings shall not disclose—

(1) The number of offerors;

(2) The identity of other offerors;

(3) The content of other offerors' proposals;

(4) The ranking of other offerors;

(5) The evaluation of other offerors; or

(6) Any of the information prohibited in 15.1006(e).

(g) The contracting officer shall include an official summary of the debriefing in the contract file. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

¶ 30,175 FAR 15.1006

[¶ 30,175]

15.1006 Postaward debriefing of offerors.

(a) An offeror shall be debriefed and furnished the basis for the source selection decision and contract award, if its written request is received by the contracting officer within three days after the offeror receives notice of contract award. Offerors that requested a postaward debriefing at the time they were eliminated from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from further consideration prior to the final source selection decision shall also be provided a debriefing at this time. An offeror that failed to submit a timely request under 15.1003(a) or 15.1005(a) is not entitled to a debriefing. When practicable, debriefing requests received more than three days after the offeror receives notice of contract award may be accommodated. However, accommodating such untimely debriefing requests does not extend the time within which suspension of performance can be required, as this accommodation is not a "required debriefing" as described in part 33. To the maximum extent practicable, the debriefing should occur within five days after receipt of the written request.

(b) Debriefings of successful and unsuccessful offerors may be done orally, in writing, or by any other method acceptable to the contracting officer.

(c) The contracting officer or designee shall chair any debriefing session held. Individuals who conducted the evaluation shall provide support.

(d) At a minimum, the debriefing information shall include—

(1) The Government's evaluation of the significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the offeror's proposal, if applicable;

(2) The overall evaluated cost or price and technical rating, if applicable, of the successful offeror and the debriefed offeror;

(3) The overall ranking of all offerors when any ranking was developed by the agency during the source selection;

(4) A summary of the rationale for award;

(5) For acquisitions of commercial end items, the make and model of the item to be delivered by the successful offeror; and

(6) Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed.

(e) The debriefing shall not include point-by-point comparisons of the debriefed offeror's proposal with those of other offerors. Moreover, debriefing shall not reveal any information prohibited from disclosure by 24.202 or exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act, including—

(1) Trade secrets;

(2) Privileged or confidential manufacturing processes and techniques;

(3) Commercial and financial information that is privileged or confidential, including breakdowns, profit, indirect cost rates, and similar information; and

(4) The names of individuals providing reference information about an offeror's past performance.

(f) The contracting officer shall include an official summary of the debriefing in the contract file. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97; FAC 90-45, Final rule, 62 FR 224, 1/2/97, effective 1/1/97]

[¶ 30,175.07]

15.1007 Protests against award.

(a) Before filing a protest, prior to award of a contract, of the exclusion of an offeror

from the competitive range (or otherwise from further consideration), use of alternative dispute resolution techniques is encouraged (see subpart 33.2).

(b) Protests against award in negotiated acquisitions shall be treated substantially the same as in sealed bidding (see subpart 33.1).

(c) If, within one year of contract award, a protest causes the agency to issue either a new solicitation or a new request for best and final offers on the protested contract award, the agency shall make available to all prospective offerors for the new solicitation, or original offerors that are requested to submit new best and final offers—

(1) Information provided in any debriefings conducted on the original award about the successful offeror's proposal; and

(2) Other nonproprietary information provided to the original offerors. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

[¶ 30,175.08]

15.1008 Discovery of mistakes.

For treatment of mistakes in an offeror's proposal that are discovered before award, see 15.607. Mistakes in a contractor's proposal that are disclosed after award shall be processed in accordance with 14.407-4. [FAC 90-44, Final rule, 61 FR 69286, 12/31/96, effective 1/1/97]

[The next page is 17,031.]

SAMPLE: DEBRIEFING BULLETS

OFFER A MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Business/Management/Technical Approach

Strengths:

- Arrangement eliminates fee between major partners.
- Very good relationship and past experience shown between parent companies.
- Good discussion of responsibilities.
- Offeror A shows corporate technology development programs.
- Specifies \$90M of subcontracting to SB/SDB.
- Three team members small or small disadvantaged business.
- Approximately 3,600 personnel in Location 1.
- Show pre-screen list of subcontractors.

Weaknesses:

- Lines of authority between Proposer A and Partner are somewhat vague.
- The performance of work under TERC (pg 1-14) difficult to understand.
- Two (2) separate cost accounting systems.
- Lack of information on how PMs will access individual corporate resources.
- Does not identify what work will be subcontracted.
- Little information on work that SB will accomplish.
- Team does not include XXX/YY.

Experience/Organization/Personnel

Strengths:

- Very good subcontractors and small business participation.
- Show very good experience in Location 1 boundaries.
- Project summary shows varied experience.
- Good experience with regulators.
- Good summary table for education and experience.
- Large number of projects with CPAF, CPFF experience.
- Very good presentation of projects and SB/SDB goals.
- Average total experience of personnel levels with HTRW is 12 yrs.
- Show team members with UXO experience and soil remediation.
- Made \$90M commitment to SB/SDB.
- Good variety of spreading all kinds of activities for SB/SDB.

Weaknesses:

- Lacks detail for subcontractors experience.
- Sub experience list very brief and not very specific.
- Role of prime, joint/team members, sub, not well defined.
- Cost control discussion weak.
- No mention of labor unions in labor relations.
- Many key personnel have been with firm for a short time (1 to 7 yrs).
- Each have provided corporate health and safety plans with no discussion on which one will govern.

Operational Management Plan

Strengths:

- Demonstrate a clear understanding of facility management.
- Project personnel and procedures look good.
- Strong in all disciplines.
- Database can be accessed simultaneously by District.
- 3,978 people in Location 1 region.
- Subcontractors will be required to comply with Offeror QC plan.
- The proposal lays out a good management philosophy.
- Very detailed discussion of D.O., planning and execution, cost tracking/control procedures.
- Firm has shown single POC.
- IPEX based on ORACLE commercial software. Will provide real time information.

Weaknesses:

- No clear explanation of PM's authority to "select/assign" project managers and technical staff from the two "parent" firms.
- Unclear on how joint venture personnel and equipment/subs will be assigned.
- Both contractors have excellent MIS systems; however, it is not apparent how these will fit together.
- Most personnel located in Location 2.
- No clear explanation of how contract lab will manage contracts to a SB/SDB lab.
- Very vague description of data validation; no reference to appropriate EPA guidance.
- QA coordinator not stated.
- Did not provide the range of analysis that chosen labs can perform as requested in RFP or state primary reason why lab was chosen.
- Sample collection procedures did not cover soil sampling only surface water.

Acquisition Management Plan

Strengths:

- Procurement system is approved by Defense Contract Area Operations.
- Small business utilization rated good in August 1995.
- Have identified a small business coordinator.
- Committed to \$90M to SB/SDB subcontracting with a compliance review by SBA, which exceeds goal.
- Mentor protege for three (3) SDB's.
- Proposer shows significant increase in SB/SDB usage 1994 and exceeded the goal in 1995.

Weaknesses:

- No discussion of "best value" decision in selecting among large and SB/SDB subcontracting.
- Mentor protege are not members of team.

Sample Project

Strengths:

- Provided a discussion of how and when changes would be made.
- Have put together a good comprehensive team with key personnel located in Location 3.
- Will characterize each waste stream and has identified off-site disposal facility, show good detail in some aspects of the problem.
- Shows good groundwater extraction and discharge option. Well thought out.

Weaknesses:

- Show new team member not previously identified.
 - Provided absolutely no site specific information.
 - Was merely an outline and not abbreviated.
 - Did not provide resumes of some key personnel.
 - Hard to visualize how coordination will take place between all team members from PM on down.
 - SAP only an outline. Lacks information. No site specific details provided.
 - Question the use of field screening.
 - QAPP in outline form.
- Sample provided by USACE.

PROJECT X

DEBRIEFING OF OFFERORS

PROJECT X

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Most important	A. Management/Execution Plan	
	- 1. Completeness	Similar importance
	- 2. Cost Control	Slightly more than 3 & 4
	- 3. Flexibility	
	- 4. Ingenuity	
Equal importance	B. Past Performance	Equal importance
Slightly less than A	C. Experience	
	- 1. Cost Contracting	
	- 2. Special Structures	Equal importance
	- 3. Location 1 & OCONUS	
Somewhat less than B. & C.	D. Cost (not scored)	
	- Reasonableness	
	- Realism	
	- Completeness	
Least important	E. Subcontracting Plan (not scored)	

PROJECT X

SCORING SYSTEM

- Outstanding
- Excellent
- Satisfactory
- Poor
- Unsatisfactory
- Unacceptable

OFFEROR A

PROJECT X

OFFEROR A – SUMMARY OVERALL EVALUATION

Management/Execution Plan				Experience		
	A1	A2	A3	A4	B	C1
	Completeness	Cost Control	Flexibility	Ingenuity	Past Performance	Cost Contracting
A	Excellent	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Excellent
						Special Structures
						Location 1 & OCONUS
						Excellent

Cost		
	Reasonable	Complete
A	Yes	Yes

OFFEROR A

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COST CONTROL

- Strengths:
 - Integrated modules.
 - Responsive, flexible, timely.
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COMPLETENESS

- Strengths:
 - Addressed all required areas, complete and exceeds most requirements.
 - Highly qualified team.
 - Approach for executing the work is excellent.
- Weaknesses:
 - Proposal repetitive and contained errors.
 - Portions were apparently extracted and poorly edited from other sources unrelated.
 - Lacks Location 1 experience depth outside subcontractor.
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN FLEXIBILITY

- Strengths:
 - Experienced team.
 - Use of bilingual personnel at SPMO.
 - Available resources at PMO.
 - Subcontractor working with same OCONUS organizations.
- Weaknesses:
 - No current Offeror A resources on ground in Location 1.
 - No indication of plan to develop alternative Location 1-based resources which could be quickly mobilized to react to changing requirements.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR A

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN INGENUITY

- Strengths:
 - Experienced team approach.
- Weaknesses:
 - This factor not addressed in detail in proposal.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR A

EXPERIENCE COST CONTRACTING

- Strengths:
 - Extensive list of projects utilizing cost contracting.
 - Multi-million dollar cost contracts, several in excess of \$100m.
 - Experience in cost contracting for U.S. Government.
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

PAST PERFORMANCE

- Strengths: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - Very responsive and client oriented.
 - Good communication with customer.
 - Ahead of schedule, under budget.
 - Quality excellent.
- Weaknesses: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - Mixed feedback, "assertive but controlling."
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

EXPERIENCE SPECIAL STRUCTURES

- Strengths:
 - Excellent expertise in all special structure categories.
 - Experience in nuclear applications.
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

EXPERIENCE - LOCATION 1 AND OCONUS

- Strengths:
 - Experience OCONUS, 7 projects in past 5 years.
 - Program experience in Location 2.
 - Sub X has Location 1 experience with relevant entities and others.
 - Excellent joint team experience.
- Weaknesses:
 - Offeror A has no Location 1 experience other than subcontractor X.
 - Subcontractor X involvement not certain, dependent on government issued task orders.
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR A

COST

- Strengths:
 - Reasonable, Realistic Unit Costs, Complete
- Weaknesses:
 - High base fee (non-performance based).
 - Overall cost expected to be higher due to low labor effort.

OFFEROR B

PROJECT X

OFFEROR B – SUMMARY OVERALL EVALUATION

Management/Execution Plan					Experience			
	A1	A2	A3	A4	B	C1	C2	C3
Offeror	Completeness	Cost Control	Flexibility	Ingenuity	Past Performance	Cost Contracting	Special Structures	Location 1 & OCONUS
B	Satisfactory	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Cost			
	Reasonable	Realistic	Complete
B	Yes	Yes	Yes

OFFEROR B

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COMPLETENESS

- Strengths:
 - Addressed all required areas, complete and meets requirements.
 - Proposal organized and clear.
 - Acceptable approach.
- Weaknesses:
 - Demonstrates no special qualifications of organization to excel.
 - PMO staffing considered excessive.
 - Little Location 1 speaking capability at SPMO, relying on interpreters.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COST CONTROL

- Strengths:
 - Integrated modules.
 - Responsive, flexible, timely.
- Weaknesses.
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR B

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN FLEXIBILITY

- Strengths:
 - Available resources at PMO.
- Weaknesses:
 - No resources in place in Location 1.
 - Lack bilingual SPMO staff.
 - Shown a greater need for additional staffing for possible future directives.
 - No indication of plan to develop alternative Location 1 - based resources which could be quickly mobilized to react to changing requirements.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN INGENUITY

- Strengths:
 - Team approach.
- Weaknesses:
 - This factor not addressed in detail in proposal.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

PAST PERFORMANCE

- Strengths: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - Good working relationships.
 - Cooperation and integrity good.
 - Overall performance and quality satisfactory.
- Weaknesses: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - JV partner cost control and schedule difficulties on two previous projects.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

EXPERIENCE COST CONTRACTING

- Strengths:
 - Numerous, significant contracts.
 - Government and non-government experience.
 - Experience applicable to solicitation in methodology and magnitude.
- Weaknesses.
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR B

EXPERIENCE SPECIAL STRUCTURES

- Strengths:
 - Several examples of design & construction of heavy concrete structures and sophisticated systems.
- Weaknesses:
 - Did not specifically address this requirement in a separate section of proposal, making it difficult to evaluate.
 - Specific mention of design & construction of structures related to relevant material was marginal, little evidence of substantive experience.
 - Little detail as to the aspects of structures that made them "special".
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

EXPERIENCE LOCATION 1 OCONUS

- Strengths:
 - OCONUS
- Weaknesses:
 - No demonstrated Location 1 experience.
 - Limited OCONUS experience (2 projects).
 - Did not report other foreign experience.
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR B

COST

- Strengths:
 - Reasonable, Realistic, Complete.
- Weaknesses:
 - High base fee.
 - High award fee.
 - Included FCCM.
 - Overall cost high due to high estimated labor effort.

OFFEROR C

PROJECT X

OFFEROR C – SUMMARY OVERALL EVALUATION

	Management/Execution Plan					Experience		
	A1	A2	A3	A4	B	C1	C2	C3
Offeror	Completeness	Cost Control	Flexibility	Ingenuity	Past Performance	Cost Contracting	Special Structures	Location 1 & OCONUS
C	Outstanding	Excellent	Excellent	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Excellent	Excellent	Outstanding

		Cost	
		Reasonable	Realistic
C		Yes	Yes
			Complete
			Yes

OFFEROR C

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COMPLETENESS

- Strengths:
 - Clear, concise, complete.
 - Outstanding proposal in organization and clarity of presentation.
 - Outstanding approach and special qualifications.
 - Highly qualified team.
 - Support from City X.
- Weaknesses:
 - Subcontractor X roles not adequately defined.
- Outstanding rating.

OFFEROR C

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN COST CONTROL.

- Strengths:
 - Integrated modules.
 - Responsive, flexible, timely.
- Weaknesses:
 - Need to examine cost control of subcontractor X to segregate costs from other Programs. Potential for double charging.
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR C

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN FLEXIBILITY

- Strengths:
 - Working with same Location 1 organizations.
 - Use of bilingual personnel at SPMO.
 - Established offices within Location 1.
 - Available resources at PMO.
 - City X support office.
 - Experienced team.
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR C

MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN INGENUITY

- Strengths:
 - Experienced team approach.
 - City X support office.
- Weaknesses:
- Satisfactory rating.

OFFEROR C

PAST PERFORMANCE

- Strengths: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - Consistently on or ahead of schedule.
 - Within budget.
 - Quality product.
 - Customer focused, reasonable, cooperative.
 - Outstanding knowledge of Location 1 and ability to do business in Location 1.
- Weaknesses: From customer feedback on various projects.
 - None
- Outstanding rating.

OFFEROR C

EXPERIENCE COST CONTRACTING

- Strengths:
 - 25 of 90 projects in past 5 years have been cost contracts.
 - Of similar cost and scope as storage facility.
 - Several in excess of \$100m for Government
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR C

EXPERIENCE SPECIAL STRUCTURES

- Strengths:
 - Experience in all special structure categories.
 - Experience in nuclear applications.
- Weaknesses:
- Excellent rating.

OFFEROR C

EXPERIENCE OCONUS AND LOCATION 1

- Strengths:
 - Extensive experience in Location 1, OCONUS and other remote areas.
 - Subcontractors have extensive experience in Location 1 and OCONUS.
 - Work with the same Location 1 officials.
- Weaknesses:
- Outstanding rating.

OFFEROR C

COST

- Strengths:
 - Reasonable, Realistic, Complete.
- Weaknesses:
 - Overall cost expected to be higher due to low labor effort.